UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,681	06/18/2001	Kumiko Ogino	1035-329	7189

7590 05/19/2005

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.
8th Floor
1100 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, LE V	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/881,681	OGINO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Le Nguyen	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 October 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 10/29/04.

2. Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 21, 26 and 29 are independent claims; and, claims 1, 2 and 7 are newly amended.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1, 6, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1O3(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez et al. ("Sanchez") in view of Wolf.

As per claim 1, Sanchez teaches a printing output user interface control method for controlling printing job information settings for a user interface which provides a printing related information setting environment on a user interface display section formed in a printing data supply device, when printing data is supplied with the printing job information from the printing data supply device connected with a printing output device via network to the printing output device equipped with a printing job information display section which indicates printing job information by each printing job (see column 2, lines 31 - 61 and column 5 lines 9 and 10', the examiner interprets a user's work station as a data supply device, and a digital copier as a printing output device', it is taught that a suitable digital copier is a Canon GP55, and it is inherent that this printer has a printing job information display). Sanchez further teaches

a) said printing data supply device receiving language capability information of said printing job information display section from said printing output device wherein the printing data supply device has language display capabilities including language characters (see Sanchez, column 2, lines 40 - 43)',

b) comparing printing job information manually or automatically inputted in the setting environment with the capability information received by said printing data supply device in said step a) (see Sanchez, column 2, lines 47 - 51; it is inherent that information input by the user is compared with the capability information received by user's work station; and

c) providing a user with an indication to input the printing job information with information suitable for the capability of said printing output device (see column 2, lines 47 - 51 and column 5 lines 9 and 10; the examiner interprets displaying a menu of job options which are appropriate for the current capabilities of the printing output device as providing a user with an indication to input the printing job information with information suitable for the capability of said printing output device).

Sanchez does not teach providing a user with an indication to input the printing job information with characters suitable for the display capability of said printing job information display section when the printing job information is inputted with characters not suitable for the display capability of said printing job information display section, and in response to said indication the user replacing said printing job information manually or automatically inputted in the setting environment with new printing job information having characters suitable for display capability of said printing job information display

section. Wolf teaches providing a user with an indication to input information suitable for a device when the information input is not compatible with a system, and in response to the indication the user replacing the information manually or automatically inputted in the setting environment with new information suitable for capability of the system (see Wolf, column 7, line 59 - column 8, line 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the methods of Wolf with the method of Sanchez in order to ensure proper display of information on the printing output device.

As per claim 6, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6 Sanchez and Wolf teach the method of claim 6 (see rejection above). Sanchez further teaches a printing data supply device comprising a computer which reads said program from the recording medium of

Claim 6 and executes said program (see Sanchez, column 5, lines 18 and 19).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, Sanchez and Wolf teach the method of claim 8 (see rejection above). Sanchez further teaches an information processing system, wherein: the printing data supply device of Claim 8 and said printing output device are connected via network (see Sanchez, column 2, lines 15 - 16).

5. Claims 2, 3, 7, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1O3(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez et al. ("Sanchez") in view of Boss et al. ("Boss").

As per claim 2, Sanchez teaches a printing output user interface control method for controlling printing job information settings for a user interface which provides a

printing related information setting environment on a user interface display section formed in a printing data supply device, when printing data is supplied with the printing job information from the printing data supply device connected with a printing output device via network to the printing output device equipped with a printing job information display section which indicates printing job information by each printing job wherein the printing data supply device has language display capabilities including language characters (see column 2, lines 31 - 61 and column 5 lines 9 and 10., the examiner interprets a user's work station as a data supply device, and a digital copier as a printing output device; it is taught that a suitable digital copier is a Canon GP55, and it is inherent that this printer has a printing job information display). Sanchez further teaches:

a) receiving capability information of said printing data supply device from said printing output device (see Sanchez, column 2, lines 40 - 43);

b) storing printing job information in said printing data supply device, according to a user's operation (see Sanchez, column 2, lines 52 - 53); and

c) comparing printing job information manually or automatically inputted in the setting environment with the capability information received by said printing data supply device in said step a) (see Sanchez, column 2, lines 47 - 51; it is inherent that information input by the user is compared with the capability information received by user's work station).

Sanchez does not teach receiving display capability information of said printing job information display section of said printing output device, storing information on

characters suitable for the display capability of said printing job information display section and converting the inputted printing job information to the stored printing job information stored in said step b) when the printing job information is inputted with characters not suitable for the display capability of said printing job information display section.

Boss teaches receiving display capability information for a device (see Boss, column 11, line 61 - column 12, line 1; it is inherent that the display capabilities for a display device are received and stored), storing information on characters suitable for the display capability of said printing job information display section (see Boss, column 11, lines 61 - 64) and converting inputted printing job information to the stored printing job information stored in said step b) when the printing job information is inputted with characters not suitable for the display capability of said printing job information display section (see Boss, column 12, lines 10 - 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Boss with the method of Sanchez in order to ensure proper display of information on the printing output device.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Sanchez and Boss teach the method of claim 2 (see rejection above). Sanchez further teaches the printing output user interface control method of Claim 2, further comprising the steps of2 storing a plurality of printing job information in said step b) (see Sanchez, column 2, lines 52 - 53); and displaying a list of a plurality of stored printing job information on said user interface display section, and converting printing job information inputted in the setting

environment to the printing job information selected by the user (see Sanchez, column 2, lines 47 – 61; it is inherent that the information selected by the user is converted to printing job information through the graphical user interface presented to the user).

As per claim 7, it is of similar scope to claim 2 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 (see rejection above).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7 Sanchez and Boss teach the medium of claim 7 (see rejection above). Sanchez further teaches a printing data supply device comprising a computer which reads said program from the recording medium of Claim 7, and executes said program (see Sanchez, column 5, lines 18 and 19).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 9, Sanchez and Boss teach the medium of claim 9 (see rejection above). Sanchez further teaches an information processing system, wherein: the printing data supply device of Claim 9 and said printing output device are connected via network (see Sanchez, column 2, lines 15 - 16).

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1O3(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez et al. ("Sanchez") in view of Boss et al. ("Boss") further in view of Matysek et al. ("Matysek").

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, Sanchez and Boss teach the method of claim 2 (see rejection above). Sanchez further teaches the printing output user interface control method of Claim 2, further comprising the step of further converting display content when stored printing job information is selected and used for a printing job (see Sanchez, column 53 - 56).

Sanchez does not teach a plurality of printing jobs and making each printing job distinguishable. Matysek teaches a method wherein stored printing job information is selected and used for a plurality of printing jobs in order to make each printing job distinguishable (see Matysek, column 2, lines 13 - 21; it is inherent that the printing jobs will be distinguishable from each other). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the ad at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Matysek with the method of Sanchez and Boss in eliminate the labor intensive step of creating multiple copies of different jobs by the user.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1O3(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez et al. ("Sanchez") in view of Boss et al. ("Boss") further in view of Rigazio et al. ("Rigazio").

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 2, Sanchez and Boss teach the method of claim 2 (see rejection above). Sanchez and Boss teach converting printing job information. Sanchez and Boss do not teach the printing output user interface control method of Claim 2, further comprising the step of indicating the converted printing job information on said user interface display section, and prompting a user to confirm the conversion in the above conversion process.

Rigazio teaches indicating converted information on a user interface display section, and prompting a user to confirm the conversion in the conversion process (see Rigazio, column 10, lines 35 - 37', the examiner interprets receiving an input name and converting the input name into a retrieved name as a conversion process). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the ad at the time of the invention to

incorporate the method of Rigazio with the method of Sanchez and Boss in order to ensure accuracy of the conversion.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

(a) The Sanchez and Wolf references are non-analogous, and thus not properly combinable.

(b) One of ordinary skill in the art would never have taken the RPM/torque compatibility determination step of Wolf and modified Sanchez to include the same.

(c) Both Sanchez and Wolf fail to disclose or suggest "language characters".

(d) With respect to claim 2, Wolf does not disclose or suggest "converting...of said printing job information display section.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a), in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case,

Sanchez teaches providing a user with an indication to input the printing job information with information suitable for the capability of said printing output device (col. 2, lines 47-51; col. 5 lines 9-10). The teaching extracted from Wolf is for the feature of providing a user with an indication to input information suitable for a device when the information input is not compatible with a system, and in response to the indication the user replacing the information manually or automatically inputted in the setting environment with new information suitable for capability of the system (col. 7, line 59 through col. 8, line 18).

Per (b), in response to applicant's argument that one of ordinary skill in the art would never have incorporated Wolf's teaching to Sanchez, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Per (c), Sanchez's teaching comprises a printing data supply device having print job capabilities that handle text data (fig. 1 *and respective portions of the specification*) and, therefore, inherently comprises language display capability including language characters since any print job that handle words can handle language display.

Per (d), claim 2 is rejected over Sanchez in view of Boss wherein Boss teaches converting inputted printing job information to the stored printing job information stored in said step b) when the printing job information is inputted with characters not suitable for the display capability of said printing job information display section (see Boss, column 12, lines 10 - 17).

Inquires

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

LVN
Patent Examiner
May 10, 2005